



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,132	10/20/2000	Adnanus Henricus Nicolaas Roestenburg	583-1040	7838

7590

12/05/2003

William M Lee Jr
Lee Mann Smith McWilliams Sweeney & Ohlson
PO Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/693,132

Applicant(s)

ROESTENBURG ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. New corrected drawings are required in this application because the current drawings are not clear and presentable. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koeppel (US006477575B1) and in view of Lambert et al. (US006038601A).
4. With regard to *claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 45, 55 and 65-67*, Koeppel reference discloses,
 - *a data manipulation server (module 110) for disposing in-line between the client equipment unit and the content providing server, the data*

manipulation server being coupled to a data store arranged to store data relating to a user of the client equipment unit; wherein (col.6, lines 43-47; sheet 1, fig.1).

- *the data manipulation server is adapted to modify web-related data communicated between the client equipment unit and the content providing server using a predetermined amount of the data relating to the user in response to a request for obtaining the web content being transmitted from the client equipment unit (col.1, lines 7-10; col. 2, lines 41-49; sheet 4, fig.5).*

However, Koeppel reference does not explicitly disclose,

- *a client equipment unit capable of communicating with a content providing server for providing web content;*

Lambert teaches,

- *a client equipment unit capable of communicating with a content providing server for providing web content; (col.1, lines 52-54; col.5, lines 51-60; sheet 1, fig.1A; sheet 3, fig. 2; sheet 4, fig. 3).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Lambert reference with Koeppel reference to enable content providers a large amount of control over their own data and how it is presented. Content providers can supply their own graphics, advertising, ticker information, animation control, and content refresh parameters. Also, in order to gain new, or retain existing, customers,

Art Unit: 2143

providers need to ensure they present products and services that potential consumers are interested in. Accordingly, the importance of target advertising and target content provision has become an important role in the way providers conduct business over the Internet.

5. With regard to *claims 2-3, 13-14, 24-25, 35-36, 46-47 and 56-57*, Koeppel and Lambert references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 45 and 55* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Koeppel and Lambert references disclose,

- *wherein the web related data is data relating to a protocol*
- *wherein the protocol is a Hyper Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP)* (Koeppel, col.1, lines 41-42; Lambert col.1, lines 17-20; col. 5, lines 20-26).

6. With regard to *claims 4-5, 15-16, 26-27, 37-38, 48-49 and 58-59*, Koeppel and Lambert references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 45 and 55* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Koeppel and Lambert references disclose,

- *wherein the web related data is the web content*
- *wherein the web content is Hyper Text Mark-up Language (HTML) data* (Koeppel, col.1, lines 43-49; Lambert col.9, lines 46-47).

7. With regard to *claims 6-8, 17-19, 28-30, 39-41, 50-52 and 60-62*, Koeppel and Lambert references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

Art Unit: 2143

See *claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 45 and 55* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Koeppel reference discloses,

- *wherein the data relating to the user is static data*
- *wherein the static data is obtained from the user* (Koeppel, col. 4, lines 32-38; col.7, lines 49-58).
- *wherein the static data is obtained from a content provider associated with the web content* (Koeppel, col. 4, lines 32-38; col.7, lines 49-58).

8. With regard to *claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32, 42-43, 53-54 and 63-64*, Koeppel and Lambert references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 45 and 55* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Koeppel reference discloses,

- *wherein the data relating to the user is dynamic data*
- *wherein the dynamic data is obtained from an access provider associated with supporting communications between the client equipment unit and the content providing server* (Koeppel, col.4, lines 7-12, lines 32-38, lines 39-45).

9. With regard to *claims 11, 22, 33 and 44*, Koeppel and Lambert references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 45 and 55* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Lambert reference discloses,

- *wherein the data manipulation server is a proxy server* (Lambert, col. 5, lines 45-53; module 304 on sheet 3, fig.2, module 204 on sheet 4, fig.3).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Linsk (US006138142A)
- Ukita et al. (US006622174B1)
- Theriault et al. (US006049821A)

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 703/305-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703/308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703/872-9306 for regular communications and 703/872-9306 for After Final communications.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-3900.

Thomas Duong (AU2143)

Application/Control Number: 09/693,132
Art Unit: 2143

Page 7

December 1, 2003



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100